arXiv:1406.3813v3 [math.RA] 23 Jun 2014

CS-RICKART MODULES

A. N. ABYZOV AND T. H. N. NHAN

Abstract. In this paper, we introduce and study the concept of CS-Rickart modules, that is a module analogue of the concept of ACS rings. A ring R is called a right weakly semihereditary ring if every its finitly generated right ideal is of the form $P \oplus S$, where P_R is a projective module and S_R is a singular module. We describe the ring R over which $\mathrm{Mat}_n(R)$ is a right ACS ring for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We show that every finitely generated projective right R-module will to be a CS-Rickart module, is precisely when R is a right weakly semihereditary ring. Also, we prove that if R is a right weakly semihereditary ring, then every finitely generated submodule of a projective right R-module has the form $P_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus P_n \oplus S$, where every $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ is a projective module which is isomorphic to a submodule of R_R, and S_R is a singular module. As corollaries we obtain some well-known properties of Rickart modules and semihereditary rings.

1. Introduction

Throughout this paper, all rings are assumed to be associated with a nonzero unity element, and all modules are assumed to be unitary right modules. The notations $N \trianglelefteq M$, or $N \ll M$ mean that N is an *essential* (or *large*) submodule of M, or N is a *superfluous* (or *small*) submodule of M, respectively. The largest singular submodule of M will be denoted by $Z(M)$.

The concept of p.p. rings was first introduced by Hattori in 1960 (see [9]), and further studied by many authors (see, for example, [2, 7, 11]). A ring R is called a right *p.p. ring* (or a *Rickart ring*) if every principal right ideal of R is to be projective, or equivalently, if the right annihilator of each element of R is generated by an idempotent as a right ideal. According to [15], the notion of Rickart rings was generalized to a module theoretic version. A right R-module M is called

Date: June 24, 2014.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 16D10; Secondary 16D40, 16D80.

Key words and phrases. CS-Rickart modules, Rickart modules, ACS rings, semihereditary rings.

a *Rickart module* if for every $\varphi \in S = \mathrm{End}_R(M)$ then $\mathrm{Ker}\varphi = eM$ for some $e^2 = e \in S$. The notion of dual Rickart modules was introduced in [17]. A module M is called a *d-Rickart module* (or a *dual Rickart module*) if for every $\varphi \in S = \mathrm{End}_R(M)$ then $\mathrm{Im}\varphi = eM$ for some $e^2 = e \in S$. Many characterizations of Rickart modules and d-Rickart modules are given in [15, 17]. Article [16] has described the class of rings over which each finitely generated projective right module as a Rickart module. Moreover, the authors also studied the structure of rings over which direct sums of Rickart modules are also Rickart modules.

A ring R is called a right *ACS ring* if the right annihilator of every element of R is an essential submodule of a direct summand of R_R (see [18, 19]). The concept of ACS rings has been studied in articles [18, 19, 28], is a proper generalization of Rickart rings. It is known that R is a right ACS ring which is also a right C_2-ring if and only if R is semiregular and $J(R) = Z_r(R)$ (see [19, Theorem 2.4]).

Recall that a module M is called an *SIP module* (respectively, *SSP module*) if the intersection (or the sum) of any two direct summands of M is also a direct summand of M. Modules having the SIP or the SSP have been studied by many authors (see [8, 10, 25]). It is shown that every Rickart module has the SIP and every d-Rickart module has the SSP (see [15, Proposition 2.16] and [16, Proposition 2.11]).

A module M is called an *SIP-CS module* if the intersection of any two direct summands of M is essential in a direct summand of M. We say that a submodule N of a module M *lies above a direct summand* of M if there is a decomposition $M = N_1 \oplus N_2$ such that $N_1 \subset N$ and $N_2 \cap N$ small in N_2. A module M is called an *SSP-d-CS module* if the sum of any two direct summands of M lies above a direct summand of M. While SIP-CS modules are proper generalizations of both SIP modules and CS modules (see [12, 13]), SSP-d-CS are proper generalizations of both SSP modules and d-CS modules (see [22).

A module is called a *CS module* if every its submodule is essential in a direct summand. Dually, a module is called a *d-CS module* (or a *lifting module*) if every its submodule lies above a direct summand(see [5, 6]).

In this paper, we introduce and study the notion of CS-Rickart modules, that is a module analogue of the notion of ACS rings. A module M is called a *CS-Rickart module* if $\mathrm{Ker}\varphi$ is essential in a direct summand of M for every $\varphi \in S = \mathrm{End}_R(M)$. Dually, a module M is called a *d-CS-Rickart module* if $\mathrm{Im}\varphi$ lies above a direct summand of M for every $\varphi \in S = \mathrm{End}_R(M)$. In [1] CS-Rickart modules were first introduced and some of the results of this paper have been presented without proof as a brief communication.

In Section 2, we provide some characterizations and investigate their properties. We show that any direct summand of a CS-Rickart module or CS-Rickart module inherits the property (see Lemma 2.1), while this is not so for direct sums (see Example 3.9). We show that the class of rings over which every right module is CS-Rickart, is precisely the class of rings over which every right module is d-CS-Rickart (see Lemma 2.6). We show that every CS-Rickart module has the SIP-CS and every d-CS-Rickart module has the SSP-d-CS. Also we prove that, the right ACS and the right essentially Baer properties coincide for a ring with the minimum condition on right annihilators (see Proposition 2.11).

In Section 3, we establish connections between the CS-Rickart property of a module and its d-CS-Rickart property (see Theorem 3.3) which is a generalization of [19, Theorem 2.4]. We also give conditions for a finitely generated projective module to be a CS-Rickart module which is also a C_2 module (see Theorem 3.5, Theorem 3.6). We conclude this section with conditions which allow a direct sum of CS-Rickart modules (respectively, d-CS-Rickart modules) to be CS-Rickart (or d-CS-Rickart) (see Theorem 3.7, Theorem 3.10).

We call a module M_R is a *weakly semihereditary module* if every finitely generated submodule of M is of the form $P \oplus S$, where P_R is a projective module and S_R is a singular module. A ring R is called a *right weakly semihereditary ring* if the module R_R is weakly semihereditary. In Section 4, it is shown that every finitely generated projective right R-module will to be a CS-Rickart module, is precisely when R is a right weakly semihereditary ring. Also we prove that R is a right weakly semihereditary ring if and only if every finitely generated submodule of a projective right R-module has the form $P_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus P_n \oplus S$, where every $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ is a projective module which is isomorphic to a submodule of R_R and S is a singular module.

Our results in this paper also give uniform approaches to the works in [15], [16], [17], [19], [28].

2. Preliminary results

The following lemmas can be verified directly. They show that every direct summand of a CS-Rickart module (or d-CS-Rickart module) is inherited the property; direct sums of CS-Rickart modules (or d-CS-Rickart modules), submodules of CS-Rickart modules are inherited the property by some conditions.

Lemma 2.1. *The following implications hold:*

(1) *Every direct summand of a CS-Rickart module is a CS-Rickart module.*
(2) *Every direct summand of a d-CS-Rickart module is a d-CS-Rickart module.*

Lemma 2.2. *Let $M = \bigoplus_{i\in I} M_i$ and M_i is a fully invariant submodule of M for every $i \in I$. Then the following implications hold:*

(1) *If I is an arbitrary index set then M is a CS-Rickart module if and only if each M_i is a CS-Rickart module for every $i \in I$.*
(2) *If $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$ then M is a d-CS-Rickart module if and only if each M_i is a d-CS-Rickart module for every $i \in I$.*

Lemma 2.3. *Let M be a CS-Rickart module, and let N be a fully invariant submodule of M. If every endomorphism $\varphi \in \mathrm{End}_R(N)$ can be extended to an endomorphism $\overline{\varphi} \in \mathrm{End}_R(M)$, then N is a CS-Rickart module.*

While every direct summand of CS-Rickart module inherits the property, this is not so for direct sums (see Example 3.9). We give conditions which allow direct sums of CS-Rickart modules to be CS-Rickart.

Lemma 2.4. *Let A be an uniform hereditary right R-module, B be a singular uniform Artinian right R-module. Then the following statements hold:*

(1) *$A \oplus B$ is a CS-Rickart module.*
(2) *If B is not an A-injective module, then $A \oplus B$ is not a CS module.*

Proof. (1) Let $f \in \mathrm{End}_R(A \oplus B)$ is an injective homomorphism and π is the projection from $A \oplus B$ to A. Since A is a hereditary module and B is a singular module, $\pi f(B) = 0$ and so $\mathrm{Ker}(\pi f) = A_0 \oplus B$, where A_0 is a direct summand of A. Since A is an indecomposable module, either $A_0 = A$ or $A_0 = 0$. If $A_0 = 0$ then $\mathrm{Ker} f = \mathrm{Ker} f_{|B}$ and so $\mathrm{Ker} f \trianglelefteq B$. Otherwise, $A_0 = A$. Then the homomorphism f induces a homomorphism from A to B and so $\mathrm{Ker} f_{|A} \trianglelefteq A$ by the singularity of B. If $\mathrm{Ker} f_{|B} \neq 0$ then $\mathrm{Ker} f \trianglelefteq A \oplus B$. If $\mathrm{Ker} f_{|B} = 0$ then f induces an isomorphism from B to B since B is an Artinian module. Therefore, for any element $a \in A$ there exists $b \in B$ such that $f(a) = f(b)$ and so $f(a - b) = 0$. Thus $\pi \mathrm{Ker} f = A$, $\mathrm{Ker} f \cap B = 0$ and hence $\mathrm{Ker} f \oplus B = A \oplus B$.

(2) Since B is not an A-injective, then there exists a submodule A_0 of A and a homomorphism $f : A_0 \to A$ which cannot be extended to a homomorphism from A to B. If the module $A \oplus B$ is a CS module, $N = \{a + f(a) \mid a \in A_0\} \trianglelefteq e(A \oplus B)$ for some $e = e^2 \in \mathrm{End}_R(A \oplus B)$. Since

$Z(e(A \oplus B)) = 0$, $Z(A \oplus B) = B \subset (1-e)(A \oplus B)$ and consequently $B = (1-e)(A \oplus B)$. As a result $A \oplus B = e(A \oplus B) \oplus B$. This leads to $e(A \oplus B) = \{a + f'(a) \mid a \in A\}$, $f'_{|A_0} = f$ for some homomorphism $f' : A \to B$. This contradiction shows that the module $A \oplus B$ is not a CS module. □

Example 2.5. If R is a Dedekind domain and P is a nonzero prime ideal of R, then it is deduced from the previous lemma that R-module $R \oplus (R/P^n)$, where n is a natural number, is a CS-Rickart module and is a direct sum of CS modules but is not a CS module.

We now describe the class of rings over which every module is a CS-Rickart module.

Lemma 2.6. *The following conditions are equivalent for a ring R:*

(1) *Every right R-module is d-CS-Rickart.*
(2) *Every right R-module is CS-Rickart.*
(3) *R is a left and right Artinian serial ring with $(J(R))^2 = 0$.*

Proof. The implications (3) $\Rightarrow$ (1) and (3) $\Rightarrow$ (2) are concluded from [24].

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (3). According to [24], it suffices to show that every right module over the ring R is a lifting module. Let M be an arbitrary right R-module and N be a submodule of M. Consider the module $N \oplus M$ and the homomorphism $f \in \mathrm{End}(N \oplus M)$ is defined by $f(n, m) = (0, n)$. Then $f(N \oplus M) = (0, N)$ lies above a direct summand of $N \oplus M$. Consequently, the module N lies above a direct summand of M.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3). According to [24], it suffices to show that every right module over R is a CS module. Let M be an arbitrary right R-module and N be a submodule of M. Consider the module $M \oplus (M/N)$ and the homomorphism $f \in \mathrm{End}(M \oplus (M/N))$ is defined by $f(m, n) = (0, m + N)$. Then for some idempotent $e \in \mathrm{End}(M \oplus (M/N))$, the module $e(M \oplus (M/N))$ is an essential extension of the module $\mathrm{Ker} f = (N, M/N)$. Consequently, the direct summand $e(M \oplus (M/N)) \cap (M, 0)$ of $(M, 0)$ is an essential extension of $(N, 0)$. □

It is easy to see that a right Rickart module (respectively d-Rickart module) is a right CS-Rickart module (or d-CS-Rickart module), but the converse is not true, in general. A module M is called a $\mathcal{K}$-*nonsingular module* if, for every essential submodule N of M and every homomorphism $\varphi \in \mathrm{End}_R(M)$, from the equation $\varphi(N) = 0$ implies that $\varphi = 0$. Dually, a module M is called a $\mathcal{T}$-*noncosingular module* if, for every homomorphism $0 \neq \varphi \in \mathrm{End}_R(M)$, $\mathrm{Im}\varphi$ is not small in M. We now establish a connection between CS-Rickart modules and Rickart modules. The following two lemmas can be verified directly.

Lemma 2.7. *For a right R-module M, the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) *M is a $\mathcal{K}$-nonsingular CS-Rickart module.*
(2) *M is a Rickart module.*

Lemma 2.8. *For a right R-module M, the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) *M is a $\mathcal{T}$-noncosingular d-CS-Rickart module.*
(2) *M is a d-Rickart module.*

It is known that every Rickart module has the SIP and every d-Rickart module has the SSP. Our next two propositions show that every CS-Rickart module has the SIP-CS and every d-CS-Rickart module has the SSP-d-CS.

Proposition 2.9. *Let M be a CS-Rickart module and $S = \mathrm{End}_R(M)$. Then the following statements hold:*

(1) *If $A = eM$, $B = fM$ for some $e^2 = e \in S$ and $f^2 = f \in S$, then there exists $g^2 = g \in S$ such that $eM \cap fM \trianglelefteq gM$.*
(2) *If $A \trianglelefteq eM$, $B \trianglelefteq fM$ for some $e^2 = e \in S$ and $f^2 = f \in S$, then there exists $g^2 = g \in S$ such that $A \cap B \trianglelefteq gM$.*
(3) *For arbitrary $\varphi_1, ..., \varphi_n \in S$, there exists an idempotent $e \in S$ such that $\bigcap_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n} \mathrm{Ker}\varphi_i \trianglelefteq eM$.*
(4) *M is an SIP-CS module .*

Proof. (1) Since $(1-e)M \subset \mathrm{Ker}(1-f)e$, this implies that $\mathrm{Ker}(1-f)e = eM \cap \mathrm{Ker}(1-f)e \oplus (1-e)M = eM \cap \mathrm{Ker}(1-f) \oplus (1-e)M$. There exists $h^2 = h \in S$ such that $\mathrm{Ker}(1-f)e \trianglelefteq hM$ due to M is a CS-Rickart module. Since $(1-e)M \subset hM$, it follows that $hM = hM \cap (eM \oplus (1-e)M) = hM \cap eM \oplus (1-e)M$. Thus $eM \cap \mathrm{Ker}(1-f) \oplus (1-e)M \trianglelefteq hM \cap eM \oplus (1-e)M$ and so $eM \cap fM = eM \cap \mathrm{Ker}(1-f) \trianglelefteq hM \cap eM$. Since $eM \cap hM$ is a direct summand of hM, $eM \cap hM$ is a direct summand of M.

(2) and (4) follow from (1) while (3) follows from (2). □

Proposition 2.2 of [18] gives a proposition of right ACS and left C_3 rings. It follows from the previous proposition that we can remove the assumption R is a left C_3 ring.

Corollary 2.10. *Let R be a right ACS. Then for any $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ of R, there exists an idempotent $e \in R$ such that $r_R(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \trianglelefteq eR$.*

We recall that a ring R is called a ring with the *minimum condition on right annihilators* if R does not contain an infinite descending chain of right ideals that are right annihilators of subsets of R. A ring R

is called a *right essentially Baer ring* if the right annihilator of any nonempty subset of R is essential in a direct summand (see [4, Definition 8.1.1]). It follows from the previous proposition that, for a ring with the minimum condition on right annihilators, the right ACS and the right essentially Baer properties coincide.

Corollary 2.11. *Let R be a ring with the minimum condition on right annihilators. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) *R is a right ACS ring.*
(2) *R is a right essentially Baer ring.*

Proposition 2.12. *Let M be a d-CS-Rickart module and and $S = \mathrm{End}_R(M)$. Then the following statements hold:*

(1) *If $A = eM$, $B = fM$ for some $e^2 = e \in S$ and $f^2 = f \in S$, then there exists $g^2 = g \in S$ such that $A + B$ lies above gM.*
(2) *If A lies above eM, B lies above fM for some $e^2 = e \in S$ and $f^2 = f \in S$, then there exists $g^2 = g \in S$ such that $A + B$ lies above gM.*
(3) *For arbitrary homomorphisms $\varphi_1, ..., \varphi_n \in S$, there exists an idempotent $e \in S$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{Im}\varphi_i$ lies above eM.*
(4) *M is an SSP-d-CS module.*

Proof. (1) Since M is a d-CS-Rickart module, there exists $h^2 = h \in S$ such that $hM \subset (1-e)fM$ and $(1-h)(1-e)fM \ll M$. Since $eM + fM = eM \oplus (1-e)fM$, it follows that $eM + fM = eM \oplus hM \oplus (1-h)(1-e)fM$. Therefore, according to [5, 22.1], the module $eM + fM$ lies above the direct summand $eM \oplus hM$ of M.

(2) and (4) follow from (1), and (3) follows from (2). □

We give connections between CS-Rickart modules and CS modules; d-CS-Rickart modules and d-CS modules.

Corollary 2.13. *The following implications hold:*

(1) *If M is a CS-Rickart module and every submodule of M_R is a right annihilator in M of some finitely generated left ideal of $S = \mathrm{End}_R M$, then M is a CS module.*
(2) *If M is a d-CS-Rickart module and every submodule of M_R is a sum of finitely many homomorphic images of $S = \mathrm{End}_R M$ then M is a d-CS module.*

Proof. (1) If $N \leq M$ then $N = r_M(\varphi_1, ..., \varphi_n)$ for some $\varphi_1, ..., \varphi_n \in S$. Since M is a CS-Rickart module, by Proposition 2.9, there exists an idempotent $e \in S$ such that $r_M(\varphi_1, ..., \varphi_n) \trianglelefteq eM$.

(2) If $N \leq M$ then $N = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \varphi_i N$ for some $\varphi_1, ..., \varphi_n \in S$. Since M is a d-CS-Rickart module, by Proposition 2.12, there exists an idempotent $e \in S$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \varphi_i N$ lies above eM. □

3. CS-Rickart modules and C_2 condition

Let M_R be a module. Every module which is isomorphic to a submodule of some homomorphic image of a direct sum of copies of M is called an *M-subgenerated module*. The full subcategory of all right R-modules consists of all M-subgenerated modules is denoted by $\sigma(M)$. It is called *the Wisbauer category of the module M*.

Let M and N be right R-modules. We then define $Z_M(N)$ as *the largest M-singular submodule of N*, it means that

$$Z_M(N) = \sum_{f \in \mathrm{Hom}_R(X,N), \mathrm{Ker} f \trianglelefteq X, X \in \sigma(M)} f(X).$$

To prove the main theorem of this section, we give two useful lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *The following statements hold:*

(1) *If M is a right R-module and P is a projective module in the category $\sigma(M)$, then, for any submodule N of P, the following conditions are equivalent:*
   (a) *N is an essential submodule of P;*
   (b) *P/N is an M-singular module.*

(2) *If M is a right R-module, then every nonzero projective module in the category $\sigma(M)$ is not an M-singular.*

(3) *If R-module P is a nonzero finitely generated quasi-projective module, then $Z_P(P) \neq P$.*

Proof. (1) Let P/N be an M-singular module and $f : P \to P/N$ be the natural homomorphism. There exists an epimorphism $g : A \to P/N$ for some module $A \in \sigma(M)$ such that $\mathrm{Ker} g \trianglelefteq A$. Since P is a projective module in the category $\sigma(M)$, there exists a homomorphism h such that $gh = f$. Therefore, $N = h^{-1}(\mathrm{Ker} g) \trianglelefteq P$.

(2) and (3) follow directly from (1). □

Lemma 3.2. *Let M be a right R-module, P be a projective module in the category $\sigma(M)$ and $N \in \sigma(M)$. Then, for any homomorphism $\varphi \in \mathrm{Hom}_R(P, N)$, the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) *$\mathrm{Ker}(\varphi) \trianglelefteq eP$ for some $e^2 = e \in \mathrm{End}_R(P)$.*

(2) *$\varphi P = P_0 \oplus S$, where P_0 is a projective module in the category $\sigma(M)$ and S is an M-singular module.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). This implication can be verified directly.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Let π be the projection from $P_0 \oplus S$ onto P_0. Since P_0 is a projective module in the category $\sigma(M)$, this suggests that $P = \mathrm{Ker}(\pi\phi) \oplus eP$ for some $e^2 = e \in \mathrm{End}_R(P)$. Then $S \cong \mathrm{Ker}(\pi\phi)/\mathrm{Ker}(\phi)$ which is deduced from the previous lemma that $\mathrm{Ker}(\varphi) \trianglelefteq \mathrm{Ker}(\pi\phi)$. □

Let M be a right R-module. Denote by $\nabla(M)$ the set $\{f \in \mathrm{End}_R M \mid \mathrm{Im}f \ll M\}$ and $\triangle\ (M)$ the set $\{f \in \mathrm{End}_R M \mid \mathrm{Ker}f \trianglelefteq M\}$. Now we establish connections between the CS-Rickart property of a module and its d-CS-Rickart property.

Theorem 3.3. *Let M be a right R-module and P be a projective module in the category $\sigma(M)$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) *For any homomorphism $\varphi \in \mathrm{End}_R(P)$, we have $\varphi(P) = eP \oplus P'$, where P' is an M-singular module and $e^2 = e \in \mathrm{End}_R(P)$.*
(2) *P is a CS-Rickart module satisfying C_2 condition.*
(3) *P is a d-CS-Rickart module satisfying $\triangle\ (P) = \nabla(P)$.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). The previous lemma implies that the module P is a CS-Rickart module. Let P_0 be a submodule of P. If $P_0 \cong eP$ for some $e^2 = e \in \mathrm{End}_R(P)$, then P_0 is a projective module in $\sigma(M)$. Consequently, there exists a homomorphism $f \in \mathrm{End}_R(P)$ such that $\mathrm{Im}f = P_0$. Since the condition of (1) and Lemma 3.1, P_0 is a direct summand of P.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1). The implication is drawn from the previous lemma.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (3). The inclusion $\nabla(P) \subset \triangle\ (P)$ is deduced from Lemma 3.1. First, we prove $\triangle\ (P) \subset \nabla(P)$. Let $\phi \in \triangle\ (P)$. Since $\mathrm{Ker}(1-\phi) = 0$ and P satisfies the C_2 condition, $(1-\phi)P$ is a direct summand of P. Consequently, homomorphism $1-\phi$ is a left invertible. Since $\triangle\ (P)$ is an ideal of $\mathrm{End}_R(P)$, this implies that $\triangle\ (P) \subset J(\mathrm{End}_R(P))$. Therefore, according to [26, 22.2] we have the inclusion $\triangle\ (P) \subset \nabla(P)$.

We next demonstrate that P is a d-CS-Rickart module. Let $\phi \in \mathrm{End}_R(P)$. The conditions of (1) show that $\phi(P) = eP \oplus P'$ where P' is an M-singular module and $e^2 = e \in \mathrm{End}_R(P)$. Let π be the projection from $eP \oplus P'$ onto P'. Lemma 3.1 follows that $\mathrm{Ker}\pi\phi \trianglelefteq P$. Since $\triangle\ (P) = \nabla(P)$, this implies that $\pi\phi(P) = P' \ll P$ and so $\phi(P)$ lies above the direct summand eP of P.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1). Let $\phi \in \mathrm{End}_R(P)$. Since P is a d-CS-Rickart module, $\phi(P) = eP \oplus (1-e)\phi(P)$ for some $e^2 = e \in \mathrm{End}_R(P)$ and $(1-e)\phi(P) \ll P$. Thus, $(1-e)\phi \in \triangle\ (P) = \nabla(P)$ which leads to $(1-e)\phi(P)$ is an M-singular. □

Corollary 3.4 ([19, Theorem 2.4])**.** *The following conditions are equivalent for a ring R:*

(1) *R is a semiregular ring and $J(R) = Z_r(R)$.*
(2) *The ring R is a right ACS ring which is also a right C_2 ring.*
(3) *If T is a finitely generated right ideal, then $T = eR \oplus S$ where $e = e^2 \in R$ and S is a right singular ideal of R.*

Next we give a necessary and sufficient condition for a ring over which every finitely generated projective module to be a CS-Rickart module which is also a C_2 module.

Theorem 3.5. *The following conditions are equivalent for a ring R:*
(1) *R is a semiregular ring and $J(R) = Z_r(R)$;*
(2) *Every finitely generated projective R-module is a CS-Rickart module which is also a C_2 module.*

Proof. The implication (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) is deduced from Theorem 3.3.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). Let P be a finitely generated projective module. According to [26, 42.11], it follows that every finitely generated submodule of P lies above a direct summand of P. The implication is drawn directly from Theorem 3.3. □

Theorem 3.6. *Let M be a right R-module, $P \in \sigma(M)$ and $S = \mathrm{End}_R(P)$. Then, the following conditions are equivalent:*
(1) *For any $\varphi \in S$, there exists $e^2 = e \in S$ such that $eP \subseteq \varphi P$, $(1-e)\varphi P \subseteq Z_M(P)$.*
(2) *For any $\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_n \in S$, there exists $e^2 = e \in S$ such that $eP \subset \varphi_1 P + \ldots + \varphi_n P$ and $(\varphi_1 P + \ldots + \varphi_n P) \cap (1-e)P \subset Z_M(P)$.*
(3) *For any $\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_n \in S$, $\varphi_1 P + \ldots + \varphi_n P = eP \oplus U$ for some $e^2 = e \in S$ and $U \subset Z_M(P)$.*
(4) *For any $\varphi \in S$, there exists $e^2 = e \in S$ such that $\varphi P = eP \oplus U$ where $U \subset Z_M(P)$.*

If P is a projective module in the category $\sigma(M)$, then these conditions are equivalent to the condition:
(5) *P is a CS-Rickart module satisfying C_2 condition.*

Proof. The implications (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3), (3) $\Rightarrow$ (4) are obvious. The equivalent (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (4) holds true from $(1-e)\varphi P \cong U$. If P is a projective module in the category $\sigma(M)$, then the equivalent (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (5) follows from Theorem 3.3.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). We prove the implication by induction on n. When $k = 1$, the result is clearly understood. Assume that (2) is true for $k = n$. Let $\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_n, \varphi_{n+1} \in S$, then there are some idempotents $e_1, e_2 \in S$ such that $e_1 P \subset \varphi_1 P + \ldots + \varphi_n P$, $(\varphi_1 P + \ldots + \varphi_n P) \cap (1-e_1)P \subset Z_M(P)$, $e_2 P \subset \varphi_{n+1} P$ and $\varphi_{n+1} P \cap (1-e_2)P \subset Z_M(P)$. There is an idempotent $e_0 \in S$ such that $e_0 P \subset (1-e_1)e_2 P$, $(1-e_1)e_2 P =$

$e_0P \oplus (1-e_0)(1-e_1)e_2P$ and $(1-e_0)(1-e_1)e_2P \subset Z_M(P)$. Then for some idempotent $e \in S$, we have $e_1P+e_2P = eP \oplus (1-e_0)(1-e_1)e_2P$. Since $(\varphi_1P+\ldots+\varphi_nP+\varphi_{n+1}P)/eP = (e_1P+(\varphi_1P+\ldots+\varphi_nP)\cap(1-e_1)P+e_2P+\varphi_{n+1}P\cap(1-e_2)P)/eP = (e_1P+e_2P)/eP+((\varphi_1P+\ldots+\varphi_nP)\cap(1-e_1)P+eP)/eP+(\varphi_{n+1}P\cap(1-e_2)P+eP)/eP$, it follows that the module $(\varphi_1P+\ldots+\varphi_nP+\varphi_{n+1}P)/eP$ is an M-singular module. Since $(1-e)(\varphi_1P+\ldots+\varphi_nP+\varphi_{n+1}P) \cong (\varphi_1P+\ldots+\varphi_nP+\varphi_{n+1}P)/eP$, this implies that $(1-e)(\varphi_1P+\ldots+\varphi_nP+\varphi_{n+1}P) \subset Z_M(P)$. □

A module M is called *relatively CS-Rickart to* N if for every $\varphi \in \mathrm{Hom}_R(M,N)$, $\mathrm{Ker}\varphi$ is an essential submodule of a direct summand of M. A module M is called *relatively d-CS-Rickart to* N if for every $\varphi \in \mathrm{Hom}_R(M,N)$, $\mathrm{Im}\varphi$ lies above a direct summand of N.

Theorem 3.7. *Let $M = M_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus M_n$ be a C_2 right R-module. If M_i is relatively CS-Rickart to M_j for all $i,j \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$ then M is a CS-Rickart module.*

Proof. By [20, Theorem 22] and [27, Corollary 3.2]), we have $S = \mathrm{End}_R(M)$ is a semiregular ring. On the other hand, according to [20, Theorem 10] and [27, Corollary 3.2]) we have the equalities

$$J(S) = [J(\mathrm{Hom}_R(M_i,M_j)] = [\triangle\ (\mathrm{Hom}_R(M_i,M_j)] = \triangle\ [(\mathrm{Hom}_R(M_i,M_j)].$$

It follows that M is a CS-Rickart module by [26, 41.22]. □

Corollary 3.8. *Let $M = M_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus M_n$ be a right R-module of finite length. If $\mathrm{Hom}_R(\mathrm{Soc}(M_i),\mathrm{Soc}(M_j)) = 0$ for each pair of different indices $i,j \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$ and M_i is an indecomposable CS-Rickart module for every $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$, then M is a CS-Rickart module.*

The following example shows that a direct sum of CS-Rickart modules is not a CS-Rickart module, in general.

Example 3.9. Let K be a field and

$$R = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & \alpha_3 \\ 0 & \alpha_4 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha_5 \end{pmatrix} \mid \alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3 \in K \right\}.$$

Consider

$$e = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$S_1 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mid \alpha \in K \right\}, S_2 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \alpha \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mid \alpha \in K \right\}.$$

We note that S_1, S_2 are simple right R-modules and non-isomorphic. It is clear that eR and eR/S_1 are CS-Rickart modules. Now consider $M = eR \oplus eR/S_1$. We prove that M is not CS-Rickart. Let $\varphi : eR \to eR/S_1$ and $\langle\varphi\rangle = \{a + \varphi(a) \mid a \in eR\}$. Then we have $\langle\varphi\rangle \oplus eR/S_1 = M$ and $\langle\varphi\rangle \cap eR = S_1$. If M is CS-Rickart then $S_1 \trianglelefteq \pi M$, for some $\pi^2 = \pi \in \mathrm{End}_R(M)$. By Krull-Remak-Schmidt theorem, $\pi M \cong eR$ or $\pi M \cong eR/S_1$. But $\pi M \cong eR$ is not hold true because eR is not uniform, so $\pi M \cong eR/S_1$. Whenever this happens, we have a contraction since $\mathrm{Soc}(\pi M) = S_1 \ncong \mathrm{Soc}(eR/S_1) \cong S_2$. Thus M is not a CS-Rickart module. Also, in connection with Corollary 3.8, we note that $\mathrm{Hom}_R(\mathrm{Soc}(eR), \mathrm{Soc}(eR/S_1)) \neq 0$.

The following assertion is proved similarly to the previous theorem.

Theorem 3.10. *Let $M = M_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus M_n$ be a D_2 right R-module. If M_i relatively d-CS-Rickart to M_j for all $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ then M is a d-CS-Rickart module.*

We conclude this section with a complete characterization for a module when its endomorphism ring is a regular ring. The following statement follows directly from [20, Theorem 29].

Theorem 3.11 ([16, Theorem 2.29], [17, Theorem 5.11])**.** *Let $M = M_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus M_n$ be a decomposition of the right R-module M. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) $\mathrm{End}_R(M)$ *is a regular ring.*
(2) *M_i is M_j-Rickart which is also M_j-C_2 for each pair of indices $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.*
(3) *M_i is M_j-dual Rickart which is also M_j-D_2 module for each pair of indices $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.*
(4) *M is a Rickart module which is also a dual Rickart module.*

4. Weakly semihereditary rings

The following two statements can be verified directly from the well-known facts of perfect rings and semiregular rings.

Lemma 4.1. *The following conditions are equivalent for a ring R:*

(1) *R is a semiregular ring.*

(2) *Every finitely generated projective right R-module is a d-CS-Rickart module.*

Lemma 4.2. *The following conditions are equivalent for a ring R:*

(1) *R is a right perfect ring.*
(2) *Every projective right R-module is a d-CS-Rickart module.*

We describe the ring R over which $\mathrm{Mat}_n(R)$ is a right ACS ring for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Theorem 4.3. *The following conditions are equivalent for a ring R and a fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$:*

(1) *Every n-generated projective right R-module is a CS-Rickart module.*
(2) *The free R-module $R_R^{(n)}$ is a CS-Rickart module.*
(3) *$\mathrm{Mat}_n(R)$ is a right ACS ring.*
(4) *Every n-generated right ideal of R has the form $P \oplus S$, where P is a projective R-module and S is a singular right ideal of R.*
(5) *R-module $R_R^{(n)}$ is relatively CS-Rickart to R_R.*
(6) *Every n-generated submodule of $R_R^{(n)}$ has the form $P_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus P_n \oplus S$, where every $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ is a projective module which is isomorphic to a submodule of R_R and S is a singular module.*

Proof. The implications (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) and (6) $\Rightarrow$ (2) is obvious. The implication (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) is deduced from Lemma 2.1. The implication (2) $\Rightarrow$ (4) and the equivalent (4) $\Leftrightarrow$ (5) are concluded from Lemma 3.2. Next we put $S = \mathrm{End}_R(R_R^{(n)})$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3). Let $\phi \in S$. Then $\mathrm{Ker}\phi \trianglelefteq eR_R^{(n)}$ for some idempotent $e \in S$. We will prove that $r_S(\phi) \trianglelefteq eS$. The inclusion $r_S(\phi) \subset eS$ is verified directly. Let $g \in eS$ be a nonzero homomorphism. Since $gR_R^{(n)} \cap \mathrm{Ker}\phi \neq 0$, there is a homomorphism $h \in S$ such that $\phi gh = 0$ and $gh \neq 0$. Hence $r_S(\phi) \trianglelefteq eS$.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (2). Let $\phi \in S$. Then $r_S(\phi) \trianglelefteq eS$ for some idempotent $e \in S$. We will show that $\mathrm{Ker}f \trianglelefteq eR_R^{(n)}$. If $m \in \mathrm{Ker}f$ then for some homomorphism $g \in S$, we have $gR_R^{(n)} = mR$ and $\phi g = 0$. Then $eg = g$ and hence $m \in eR_R^{(n)}$. Let m be a nonzero element of $eR_R^{(n)}$, then there is a nonzero homomorphism $f \in S$ such that $fR_R^{(n)} \subset mR$. Since $r_S(\phi) \trianglelefteq eS$, we have $\phi fg = 0$ and $fg \neq 0$ for some homomorphism $g \in S$. Thus $mR \cap \mathrm{Ker}\phi \neq 0$.

(5) $\Rightarrow$ (6). Let N be an n-generated submodule of $R_R^{(n)}$. Then there exist homomorphism $f \in S$ such that $f(M) = N$. Let π_i be the projection from $R_R^{(n)}$ to its i-th component and $\varepsilon_i : R_R \to R_R^{(n)}$ be

the embedding for every $1 \leq i \leq n$. Since the module $R_R^{(n)}$ is relatively CS-Rickart to R_R, there exists an idempotent $e_1 \in S$ such that $\mathrm{Ker}\pi_1 f \trianglelefteq e_1 R_R^{(n)}$. This implies that $\mathrm{Ker}f \subset \mathrm{Ker}\pi_1 f$. Now consider the homomorphism $\pi_2 f_{|e_1 R_R^{(n)}}$. For some idempotent $e_2 \in S$ we have the inclusions $\mathrm{Ker}f \subset \mathrm{Ker}\pi_2 f_{|e_1 R_R^{(n)}} \trianglelefteq e_2 R_R^{(n)}$ and $e_2 R_R^{(n)} \subset e_1 R_R^{(n)}$. Furthermore, we obtain a family of idempotents $e_1, \ldots, e_n \in S$ such that $R_R^{(n)} = e_1 R_R^{(n)} \oplus P_1, e_1 R_R^{(n)} = e_2 R_R^{(n)} \oplus P_2, \ldots, e_{n-1} R_R^{(n)} = e_n R_R^{(n)} \oplus P_n$, where every $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ is isomorphic to a submodule of R_R, and

$\mathrm{Ker}f \subset \mathrm{Ker}\pi_1 f \trianglelefteq e_1 R_R^{(n)}$,
$\mathrm{Ker}f \subset \mathrm{Ker}\pi_2 f_{|e_1 R_R^{(n)}} \trianglelefteq e_2 R_R^{(n)}$,
$\ldots$
$\mathrm{Ker}f \subset \mathrm{Ker}\pi_n f_{|e_{n-1} R_R^{(n)}} \trianglelefteq e_n R_R^{(n)}$,
$e_n R_R^{(n)} \subset \ldots \subset e_2 R_R^{(n)} \subset e_1 R_R^{(n)}$.

Then we have $\mathrm{Ker}f \subset \mathrm{Ker}\pi_1 f \cap \mathrm{Ker}\pi_2 f_{|e_1 R_R^{(n)}} \cap \ldots \cap \mathrm{Ker}\pi_n f_{|e_{n-1} R_R^{(n)}} \trianglelefteq e_n R_R^{(n)}$. If $p \in \mathrm{Ker}\pi_1 f \cap \mathrm{Ker}\pi_2 f_{|e_1 R_R^{(n)}} \cap \ldots \cap \mathrm{Ker}\pi_n f_{|e_{n-1} R_R^{(n)}}$, then $f(p) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \varepsilon_i \pi_i f(p) = 0$. Thus $\mathrm{Ker}f = \mathrm{Ker}\pi_1 f \cap \mathrm{Ker}\pi_2 f_{|e_1 R_R^{(n)}} \cap \ldots \cap \mathrm{Ker}\pi_n f_{|e_{n-1} R_R^{(n)}}$ and therefore $\mathrm{Ker}f \trianglelefteq e_n R_R^{(n)}$. Since $R_R^{(n)} = P_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus P_n \oplus e_n R_R^{(n)}$, implies $N = f(R_R^{(n)}) \cong P_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus P_n \oplus (e_n R_R^{(n)}/ker(f))$. □

Now we describe the right weakly semihereditary rings.

Theorem 4.4. *The following conditions are equivalent for a ring R:*

(1) *Every finitely generated projective right R-module is CS-Rickart.*
(2) *The free R-module $R_R^{(n)}$ is a CS-Rickart module for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*
(3) $\mathrm{Mat}_n(R)$ *is a right ACS ring for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*
(4) *For some positive integer m, every finitely generated right ideal of the ring* $\mathrm{Mat}_m(R)$ *has the form $P \oplus S$, where P is a projective* $\mathrm{Mat}_m(R)$*-module and S is a singular right ideal of* $\mathrm{Mat}_m(R)$.
(5) *R is a right weakly semihereditary ring.*
(6) *Every finitely generated submodule of projective right R-module has the form $P_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus P_n \oplus S$, where every $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ is a projective module which is isomorphic to a submodule of R_R and S is a singular module.*

Proof. The equivalent of (1), (2), (3), (5), (6) is deduced from Theorem 4.3.

(4) $\Rightarrow$ (2). Let $R_R^{(n_0)}$ be a finitely free right R-module. Choose a natural number k such that $km > n_0$, Theorem 4.3 implies that the ring $M_k(M_m(R)) \cong M_{km}(R)$ is a right ACS ring. Theorem 4.3 and Lemma 2.1 then infer that the module $R_R^{(n_0)}$ is a CS-Rickart module.

(5) $\Rightarrow$ (4) Theorem 4.3 implies that for every natural number k, the ring $M_{km}(R) \cong M_k(M_m(R))$ is a right ACS ring. The implication is drawn from Theorem 4.3. □

We call a ring R is a *right weakly hereditary ring* if every right ideal of R is of the form $P \oplus S$, where P_R is a projective module and S_R is a singular module. From [3, Theorem 3.2.10], right co-H-rings are right weakly hereditary rings. In particular, weakly hereditary rings are Artinian serial rings and QF-rings. For a right Artinian ring, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 4.5. *Let R be a right Artinian ring. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) $\mathrm{Mat}_n(R)$ *is a right essentially Baer ring for every* $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
(2) R *is a right weakly hereditary ring.*

The next corollary is a result of the previous theorem, Lemma 2.7 and the fact that R is a right nonsingular ring if and only if $\mathrm{Mat}_n(R)$ is a right nonsingular ring for all positive integer n.

Corollary 4.6 ([16, Theorem 3.6])**.** *The following conditions are equivalent for a ring R:*

(1) *Every finitely generated projective right R-module is a Rikart module.*
(2) *The free R-module $R_R^{(n)}$ is a Rickart module for every* $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
(3) $\mathrm{Mat}_n(R)$ *is a right p.p. ring for every* $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
(4) R *is a right semihereditary ring.*
(5) *The ring* $\mathrm{Mat}_n(R)$ *is a right semihereditary ring for some natural number n.*

References

[1] A. N. Abyzov and T. H. N. Nhan, *CS-Rickart modules*, Russian Mathematics (Iz. VUZ) 58:5 (2014), 48-52.
[2] E.P. Armendariz, *A note on extensions of Baer and P.P.-rings*, J. Austral. Math. Soc. 18 (1974), 470-473.
[3] Y. Baba; K. Oshiro, *Classical Artinian Rings and Related Topics*, World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., 2009.
[4] Gary F. Birkenmeier, Jae Keol Park, S.Tariq Rizvi, *Extensions of Rings and Modules*, Springer-Verlag New York Inc., 2013.
[5] J. Clark, C. Lomp, N. Vanaja and R. Wisbauer, *Lifting Modules. Supplements and Projectivity in Module Theory*, Frontiers in Mathematics, Birkhäuser, Basel-Boston-Berlin, 2006.
[6] N.V. Dung, D.V. Huynh, P.F. Smith, and R. Wisbauer, *Extending Modules*, Longman Scientific & Technical, 1994.
[7] S. Endo, *Note on p.p. rings*, Nagoya Math. J. 17 (1960), 167-170.

[8] J . L. Garcia, *Properties of direct summands of modules*, Communications in Algebra 17:1 (1989), 73-92.
[9] A. Hattori, *A foundation of torsion theory for modules over general rings*, Nagoya Math. J. 17 (1960), 147-158.
[10] J . Hausen, *Modules with summand intersection property*, Communications in Algebra 17:1 (1989), 135-148.
[11] S. Jøndrup, *p.p. rings and finitely generated flat ideals*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 28:2 (1971), 431-435.
[12] F. Karabacak, *On generaliaztions of extending modules*, Kyungpook Math. J. 49 (2009) , 557-562.
[13] F. Karabacak and A. Tercan, *On modules and matrix rings with SIP-extending*, Taiwanese J. Math. 11 (2007), 1037-1044.
[14] F. Kasch, *Modules and Rings*, Academic Press, London, England, 1982.
[15] G. Lee, S. T. Rizvi, C. S. Roman, *Rickart Modules*, Communications in Algebra 38:11 (2010) 4005-4027.
[16] G. Lee, S. T. Rizvi, C. S. Roman, *Direct sums of Rickart modules*, Journal of Algebra 353:1 (2012) 62-78.
[17] G. Lee, S. T. Rizvi, C. S. Roman, *Dual Rickart Modules*, Communications in Algebra 39:11 (2011) 4036-4058.
[18] W. Li, J. Chen, *When CF rings are Artinian*, Journal of Algebra and Its Applications 12:4 (2013).
[19] W. K. Nicholson, M. F. Yousif, *Weakly continous and C_2 rings*, Communications in Algebra 29:6 (2001) 2429-2446.
[20] W. K. Nicholson, Y. Zhou, *Semiregular Morphisms*, Communications in Algebra, 34: 1 (2006), 219-233
[21] Rizvi S.T., Roman C.S, *Baer and quasi-Baer modules*, Communications in Algebra 32:1 (2004), 103-123.
[22] Y. Talebi, Ali Reza Moniri Hamzekolaee, *On SSP-Lifting Modules*, East-West Journal of Mathematics 01 (2013), 1-7.
[23] D.K. Tütüncü, R. Tribak, *On dual Baer modules*, Glasgow Math. J., 52:2 (2010), 261-269.
[24] N. Vanaja, V. M. Purav, *Characterization of generalized uniserial rings in terms of factor rings*, Communications in Algebra 20:8 (1992), 2253-2270.
[25] G. V. Wilson, *Modules with the summand intersection property*, Communications in Algebra 14:1 (1986), 21-38.
[26] R. Wisbauer, *Foundations of Module and Ring Theory. A Handbook for Study and Research*, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, Reading, 1991.
[27] Yiqiang Zhou, *On (semi)regularity and the total of rings and modules*, Journal of Algebra 322 (2009) 562-578.
[28] Q. Zeng, *Some Examples of ACS-Rings*, Vietnam Journal of Mathematics 35:1 (2007) 11-19.

Abyzov Adel Nailevich, Chair of Algebra and Mathematical Logic, Kazan (Volga Region) Federal Univesrity, 18 Kremlyovskaya str., Kazan, 420008 Russia

E-mail address: aabyzov@ksu.ru, Adel.Abyzov@ksu.ru

Tran Hoai Ngoc Nhan, Department of IT and Mathematics Teacher Training, Dong Thap University, Vietnam

Current address: Chair of Algebra and Mathematical Logic, Kazan (Volga Region) Federal Univesrity, 18 Kremlyovskaya str., Kazan, 420008 Russia

E-mail address: tranhoaingocnhan@gmail.com